UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA JOHN and JANE DOE I, Guardians Ad Litem

for JOANN DOE I, a minor, individually, JOHN and JANE DOE II, Guardians Ad Litem for JOANN DOE II, a minor, individually, and JANE DOE III, Guardian Ad Litem for JOANN DOE III, a minor, individually,

3:18-cv-00538-HDM-WGC

ORDER

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

CARSON CITY, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada,

Defendant.

Plaintiffs.

Before the court is the defendant Carson City's ("defendant") motion to dismiss (ECF No. 7). Plaintiffs have opposed the motion (ECF No. 11), and defendant has replied (ECF No. 14). The court grants defendant's motion with respect to the Seventh Claim for Relief (vicarious liability), as plaintiffs have conceded, as they must, that vicarious liability is a theory of liability and not a separate claim for relief. (ECF No. 11 at 12.) As to plaintiffs' remaining claims, the court concludes that the plaintiffs have set forth brief statements of each claim sufficient to satisfy the pleading requirements of Federal R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) and give the defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds on which it rests. Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is granted in part and denied in part.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 25th day of February, 2019.

Howard DM: Killen

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE